



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,537	11/30/2001	Huy P. Nguyen	PALM-3777	9991
7590	04/04/2006		EXAMINER	
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP			BECK, ALEXANDER S	
Third Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Two North Market Street				2629
San Jose, CA 95113			DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,537	NGUYEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alexander S. Beck	2675	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,5-17,19-21,23 and 26-35 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,5-17,19-21,23 and 26-35 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. Acknowledgement is made of the AMENDMENT AFTER NON-FINAL filed by the Applicant on 1/23/2006, in which: independent Claims 1,17,19,21 and 23 were amended; and the rejections of the claims were traversed. **Claims 1,5-17,19-21,23 and 26-35 are currently pending in U.S. Application Serial No. 10/006,537, and an Office Action on the merits follows.**

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. **Claims 1,7-14,16,17,20,21,23,26 and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seager (US 5,235,561 A, hereinafter SEAGER) in view of Granberg**

(US 2003/0112225 A1, hereinafter GRANBERG) and *Mosgrove et al.* (US 6,317,313 B1, hereinafter MOSGROVE).

As to independent **Claim 1** and **Claims 7 and 16**, SEAGER teaches an invention that relates to a wristwatch that can be converted temporarily to a form suitable for use as a handheld radiotelephone (SEAGER: column 1, lines 5-9). SEAGER teaches in FIGS. 1-4 how device 10 includes a display 40 (SEAGER: column 2, lines 13-14) and a first keypad slider in the form of body member 20a comprising a keypad in the form of telephone control buttons 42 (SEAGER: column 2, lines 7-68). Furthermore, SEAGER teaches a second keypad slider in the form of body member 20b wherein the body member 20b comprises a keypad in the form of telephone dialing-buttons 44 (SEAGER: column 2, lines 7-68).

SEAGER does not disclose expressly how a keypad slider would cover a display when in a closed position, wherein the cover comprises a transparent window that permits viewing of a substantial portion of the display when in a closed position.

GRANBERG teaches in FIG. 3 an electronic device such as a mobile telephone with a touch screen display 1, and a movable keypad 11 that can be advantageously pulled up to a position to more or less cover the display 1 (GRANBERG: Abstract; page 2, paragraph [0015]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine SEAGER and GRANBERG because while SEAGER teaches how a handheld telephone would comprise a first keypad slider and a second keypad slider, GRANBERG teaches how such sliders would be designed within the framework of mobile telephone electronic device such that the movable keypad 11 can be advantageously pulled up to a position to more or less cover the display 1 (GRANBERG: Abstract; page 2, paragraph

[0015]). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to use the keypad slider to protect the display 1 (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0015]).

Also, by incorporating the design of SEAGER and GRANBERG, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to accomplish a second keypad slider with a display of touch screen display 1 because while SEAGER teaches how a handheld telephone would comprise a first keypad slider and a second keypad slider, GRANBERG teaches how such sliders would be designed within the framework of mobile telephone electronic device such that the movable keypad 11 can be advantageously pulled up to a position to more or less cover the touch screen display 1 (GRANBERG: Abstract; page 2, paragraph [0015]). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to use the keypad slider to protect the display 1 (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0015]).

MOSGROVE teaches in FIGS. 9,10 a handheld data processing device comprising a cover 102', the cover comprising a transparent window 107', foldably coupled to a display/processor module, and wherein the cover 102' substantially covers a display of the display/processor module and permits viewing a substantial portion of the display through the transparent window 107' when in the closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further combine the teachings of SEAGER and GRANBERG with MOSGROVE because while SEAGER and GRANBERG combine to teach a handheld telecommunications device with a first and second sliding keypad to cover a display, MOSGROVE teaches how such covers of a display would be designed within the framework of mobile telephone electronic devices such that the covers can advantageously have a transparent window that covers the display while a substantial portion of the display can be viewed through the transparent window while in a closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50). The suggestion/motivation for

combining these inventions would have been to view a substantial portion of the display when in a closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50).

As to independent **Claim 17**, SEAGER teaches an invention that relates to a wristwatch that can be converted temporarily to a form suitable for use as a handheld radiotelephone (SEAGER: column 1, lines 5-9). SEAGER teaches in FIG. 1 how device 10 includes a display 40 (SEAGER: column 2, lines 13-14), and data processing and transceiver modules by teaching dialing and control buttons, and radiotelephone communication device (SEAGER: Abstract). It is inherent that such a radiotelephone communication device would include a wireless transmitter and wireless receiver in order to accomplish a radio or wireless communication. Furthermore, SEAGER teaches in FIGS. 3,4 a microphone slider 50 and a speaker slider 52 wherein the body members 20a and 20b on which the microphone slider 50 and speaker slider 52 are embedded comprise a keypad in the form of telephone dialing buttons 42,44 (SEAGER: column 3, lines 10-22).

SEAGER does not disclose expressly how a keypad slider would cover a display when in a closed position, wherein the cover comprises a transparent window that permits viewing of a substantial portion of the display when in a closed position.

GRANBERG teaches in FIG. 3 an electronic device such as a mobile telephone with a touch screen display 1, and a movable keypad 11 that can be advantageously pulled up to a position to more or less cover the display 1, sliding relative to a data processing and transceiver module (GRANBERG: Abstract, page 2, paragraph [0015]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine SEAGER and GRANBERG because while SEAGER teaches how a handheld telephone would comprise a first keypad slider and a second keypad slider,

GRANBERG teaches how such sliders would be designed within the framework of mobile telephone electronic device such that the movable keypad 11 can be advantageously pulled up to a position to more or less cover the display 1 (GRANBERG: Abstract; page 2, paragraph [0015]). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to use the keypad slider to protect the display 1 (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0015]).

Also, by incorporating the design of SEAGER and GRANBERG, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to accomplish a second keypad slider with a display of touch screen display 1 because while SEAGER teaches how a handheld telephone would comprise a first keypad slider and a second keypad slider, GRANBERG teaches how such sliders would be designed within the framework of mobile telephone electronic device such that the movable keypad 11 can be advantageously pulled up to a position to more or less cover the touch screen display 1 (GRANBERG: Abstract; page 2, paragraph [0015]). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to use the keypad slider to protect the display 1 (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0015]).

MOSGROVE teaches in FIGS. 9,10 a handheld data processing device comprising a cover 102', the cover comprising a transparent window 107', foldably coupled to a display/processor module, and wherein the cover 102' substantially covers a display of the display/processor module and permits viewing a substantial portion of the display through the transparent window 107' when in the closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further combine the teachings of SEAGER and GRANBERG with MOSGROVE because while SEAGER and GRANBERG combine to teach a handheld telecommunications device with a first and second sliding keypad to cover a display, MOSGROVE teaches how such covers of a display would be designed within the framework of mobile telephone electronic

Art Unit: 2675

devices such that the covers can advantageously have a transparent window that covers the display while a substantial portion of the display can be viewed through the transparent window while in a closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to view a substantial portion of the display when in a closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50).

As to independent **Claim 21**, SEAGER teaches an invention that relates to a wristwatch that can be converted temporarily to a form suitable for use as a handheld radiotelephone (SEAGER: column 1, lines 5-9). Seager teaches in FIGS. 1-4 a data processing by teaching dialing and control buttons (SEAGER: Abstract) and a first keypad slider in the form of body member 20a comprising a keypad in the form of telephone control buttons 42 (SEAGER: column 2, lines 7-68). Furthermore, SEAGER teaches a second keypad slider in the form of body member 20b wherein the body member 20b comprises a keypad in the form of telephone dialing buttons 44 (SEAGER: column 2, lines 7-68).

SEAGER does not teach how a keypad slider would cover a display when in a closed position, a voice recognition processor, and a transparent window in the sliding covers to permit viewing a substantial portion of a display.

GRANBERG teaches in FIG. 3 an electronic device such as a mobile telephone with a touch screen display 1, and a movable keypad 11 that can be advantageously pulled up to a position to more or less cover the display 1, sliding relative to a data processing and transceiver module (GRANBERG: Abstract; page 2, paragraph [0015]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine SEAGER and GRANBERG because while SEAGER teaches how a handheld telephone would comprise a first keypad slider and a second keypad slider,

Art Unit: 2675

GRANBERG teaches how such sliders would be designed within the framework of mobile telephone electronic device such that the movable keypad 11 can be advantageously pulled up to a position to more or less cover the display 1 (GRANBERG: Abstract; page 2, paragraph [0015]). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to use the keypad slider to protect the display 1 (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0015]).

GRANBERG teaches in FIG. 6 how voice recognition would be incorporated into the system by teaching how the processor contains circuits 39 necessary for mobile telephony including the conversion of speech information between digital and analog states (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0020]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of SEAGER and GRANBERG because while a SEAGER teaches a microphone slider 50 and a speaker slider 52, GRANBERG teaches how voice recognition would be incorporated into the system (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0020]). The motivation for combining these inventions would have been to facilitate a robust and efficient communication by a user of the radiotelephone.

MOSGROVE teaches in FIGS. 9,10 a handheld data processing device comprising a cover 102', the cover comprising a transparent window 107', foldably coupled to a display/processor module, and wherein the cover 102' substantially covers a display of the display/processor module and permits viewing a substantial portion of the display through the transparent window 107' when in the closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further combine the teachings of SEAGER and GRANBERG with MOSGROVE because while SEAGER and GRANBERG combine to teach a handheld telecommunications device with a first and second sliding keypad to cover a display, MOSGROVE teaches how such

Art Unit: 2675

covers of a display would be designed within the framework of mobile telephone electronic devices such that the covers can advantageously have a transparent window that covers the display while a substantial portion of the display can be viewed through the transparent window while in a closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to view a substantial portion of the display when in a closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50).

As to independent **Claim 23 and Claim 35**, SEAGER teaches an invention that relates to a wristwatch that can be converted temporarily to a form suitable for use as a handheld radiotelephone (SEAGER: column 1, lines 5-9). SEAGER teaches in FIGS. 1-4 a data processing by teaching dialing and control buttons (SEAGER: Abstract), and a first keypad slider in the form of body member 20a comprising a keypad in the form of telephone control buttons 42 (SEAGER: column 2, lines 7-68). Furthermore, SEAGER teaches a second keypad slider in the form of body member 20b wherein the body member 20b comprises a keypad in the form of telephone dialing buttons 44 (SEAGER: column 2, lines 7-68).

SEAGER does not disclose expressly how a keypad slider would cover a display when in a closed position, wherein the cover comprises a transparent window that permits viewing of a substantial portion of the display when in a closed position..

GRANBERG teaches in FIG. 3 an electronic device such as a mobile telephone with a touch screen display 1, and a movable keypad 11 that can be advantageously pulled up to a position to more or less cover the display 1 (GRANBERG: Abstract; page 2, paragraph [0015]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine SEAGER and GRANBERG because while SEAGER teaches how a handheld telephone would comprise a first keypad slider and a second keypad slider,

Art Unit: 2675

GRANBERG teaches how such sliders would be designed within the framework of mobile telephone electronic device such that the movable keypad 11 can be advantageously pulled up to a position to more or less cover the display 1 (GRANBERG: Abstract; page 2, paragraph [0015]). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to use the keypad slider to protect the display 1 (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0015]).

MOSGROVE teaches in FIGS. 9,10 a handheld data processing device comprising a cover 102', the cover comprising a transparent window 107', foldably coupled to a display/processor module, and wherein the cover 102' substantially covers a display of the display/processor module and permits viewing a substantial portion of the display through the transparent window 107' when in the closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further combine the teachings of SEAGER and GRANBERG with MOSGROVE because while SEAGER and GRANBERG combine to teach a handheld telecommunications device with a first and second sliding keypad to cover a display, MOSGROVE teaches how such covers of a display would be designed within the framework of mobile telephone electronic devices such that the covers can advantageously have a transparent window that covers the display while a substantial portion of the display can be viewed through the transparent window while in a closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to view a substantial portion of the display when in a closed position (MOSGROVE: column 5, lines 41-50).

As to **Claims 8 and 20**, SEAGER teaches a detent mechanism for enabling repeatable and stable extension of the handheld device (SEAGER: column 2, lines 54-68).

As to **Claim 9**, SEAGER teaches in FIG. 4 how the end closure housing 20b would include a microphone 50.

As to **Claim 10**, SEAGER does not disclose expressly a voice recognition processor.

GRANBERG teaches in FIG. 6 how voice recognition would be incorporated into the system by teaching how the processor contains circuits 39 necessary for mobile telephony including the conversion of speech information between digital and analog states (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0020]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person ordinary skill in the art to further modify the teachings of SEAGER, GRANBERG and MOSGROVE because while a SEAGER teaches a microphone slider 50 and a speaker slider 52, GRANBERG teaches how voice recognition would be incorporated into the system (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0020]). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to facilitate a robust and efficient communication by a user of the radiotelephone.

As to **Claim 11**, SEAGER teaches in FIG. 4 how the handheld device would incorporate a speaker 52 (SEAGER: column 3, lines 1-18).

As to **Claim 12**, SEAGER teaches in FIG. 4 how the end closure housing 20b would include a microphone 50.

As to **Claims 13 and 14**, SEAGER teaches a data processing and transceiver modules by teaching dialing and control buttons, and radiotelephone communication device (SEAGER:

Abstract, wherein it is inherent that such a system would include a wireless transmitter and wireless receiver in order to accomplish a wireless communication).

As to **Claim 26**, SEAGER teaches dialing and control buttons within the device 10 (SEAGER: Abstract).

As to **Claim 28**, GRANBERG teaches how the flexible cover 11 would be coupled to the display 1 with the aid of special sensor elements (GRANBERG: page 2, paragraph [0019]).

As to **Claim 29**, SEAGER teaches a detent mechanism for enabling repeatable and stable extension of the handheld device (SEAGER: column 2, lines 54-68).

As to **Claim 30**, SEAGER teaches in FIG. 4 how the end closure housing 20b would include a microphone 50.

As to **Claim 31**, SEAGER teaches in FIG. 4 how the handheld device would incorporate a speaker 52 (SEAGER: column 3, lines 11-18).

As to **Claim 32**, SEAGER teaches in FIG. 4 how the end closure housing 20b would include a microphone 50.

As to **Claims 33 and 34**, SEAGER teaches a data processing and transceiver modules by teaching dialing and control buttons, and radiotelephone communication device (SEAGER:

Abstract, wherein it is inherent that such a system would include a wireless transmitter and wireless receiver in order to accomplish a wireless communication).

4. **Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Seager* (US 5,235,561 A) in view of *Granberg* (US 2003/0112225 A1) and *Mosgrove et al.* (US 6,317,313 B1) and *Iwata et al.* (US 6,535,749 B1, hereinafter IWATA).**

As to independent Claim 19, most of the claim limitations have already been discussed and met by references SEAGER, GRANBERG and MOSGROVE, as detailed in the above paragraphs regarding independent Claim 17, with the exception of a line selection driver, neither of which SEAGER, GRANBERG or MOSGROVE disclose expressly.

IWATA teaches a line selection driver for executing commands by using a slider to reference a line on the display (IWATA: column 5, lines 56-67).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the teachings of SEAGER, GRANBERG and MOSGROVE such that the device comprised a line selection driver, as taught/suggested by IWATA.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to execute commands by using a slider to reference a line on the display (IWATA: column 5, lines 56-67).

5. **Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Seager* (US 5,235,561 A), *Granberg* (US 2003/0112225 A1) and *Mosgrove et al.* (US 6,317,313 B1) as applied to Claims 1,7-14,16,17,20,21,23,26 and 28-35 above, and further in view of *McIntyre et al.* (US 6,549,194 B1, hereinafter MCINTYRE).**

As to **Claims 5 and 15**, SEAGER teaches dialing and control buttons within the device 10 (SEAGER: Abstract).

Neither of SEAGER, GRANBERG or MOSGROVE disclose expressly a display orientation controller.

MCINTYRE teaches in FIGS. 3A-3D a display orientation controller by teaching a touch pad controller 15 within a handheld device that is capable of facilitating the rearrangement of the keypad layout (MCINTYRE: column 3, lines 28-42).

At the time the invention was made, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of SEAGER, GRANBERG, MOSGROVE and MCINTYRE because the combination of SEAGER, GRANBERG and MOSGROVE teach a handheld device with first keypad slider in the form of body member 20a comprising a keypad in the form of telephone control buttons 42 and a second keypad slider in the form of body member 20b wherein the body member 20b comprises a keypad in the form of telephone dialing buttons 44, MCINTYRE teaches a keypad controller that is capable of facilitating the rearrangement of the keypad layout (MCINTYRE: column 3, lines 28-42). The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been to provide a privacy and security mechanism for the handheld device.

6. **Claims 6 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Seager* (US 5,235,561 A), *Granberg* (US 2003/0112225 A1) and *Mosgrove et al.* (US 6,317,313 B1) as applied to Claims 1,7-14,16,17,20,21,23,26 and 28-35 above, and further in view of *England* (US 6,483,445 B1, hereinafter ENGLAND).**

As to **Claims 6 and 27**, neither of SEAGER, GRANBERG or MOSGROVE disclose expressly wherein a keypad slider is electrically coupled to a display/processor module by a flexible ribbon connector.

ENGLAND teaches in FIG. 5 an electronic device wherein a keypad slider 24 is electrically coupled to a display module 30 by a flexible ribbon cable 42 (ENGLAND: column 2, lines 45-49).

At the time the invention was made, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of SEAGER, GRANBERG, MOSGROVE and ENGLAND because the combination of SEAGER, GRANBERG and MOSGROVE teach a handheld device with first keypad slider in the form of body member 20a comprising a keypad in the form of telephone control buttons 42 and a second keypad slider in the form of body member 20b wherein the body member 20b comprises a keypad in the form of telephone dialing buttons 44, ENGLAND teaches how a keypad slider would be electrically coupled to a display via a flexible ribbon cable. The suggestion/motivation for combining these inventions would have been transmit data signals between a keypad and display in an embodiment which requires the keypad and display to be slidable relative to one another.

#### *Response to Arguments*

7. Applicant's arguments filed 1/23/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**As to Applicant's argument (filed 1/23/2006) that SEAGER does not disclose wherein the two main body members slide relative to the display/processor,** the Examiner

Art Unit: 2675

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Alexander S. Beck** whose telephone number is (571) 272-7765. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Sumati Lefkowitz** can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

asb  
3/22/06



SUMATI LEFKOWITZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2675

notes that reference GRANBERG has been relied upon to meet this limitations as detailed in the above paragraphs regarding independent Claims 1,17,19,21 and 23.

**As to Applicant's argument that MCINTYRE discloses the key arrangements being the same in each layout and not meeting the claim limitations,** the Examiner notes that MCINTYRE discloses a plurality of different keypad layouts that are changed by a display orientation controller in response to a user input (MCINTYRE: column 3, lines 12-18,28-33).

8. **As to Applicant's arguments with respect to references IWATA and WATANABE,** the arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.